

ON THE INTEGRAL DEGREE OF INTEGRAL RING EXTENSIONS

JOSÉ M. GIRAL, LIAM O'CARROLL, FRANCESC PLANAS-VILANOVA, AND BERNAT PLANS

ABSTRACT. Let $A \subset B$ be an integral ring extension of integral domains with fields of fractions K and L , respectively. The integral degree of $A \subset B$, denoted by $d_A(B)$, is defined as the supremum of the degrees of minimal integral equations of elements of B over A . It is an invariant that lies in between $d_K(L)$ and $\mu_A(B)$, the minimal number of generators of the A -module B . Our purpose is to study this invariant. We prove that it is sub-multiplicative and upper-semicontinuous in the following three cases: if $A \subset B$ is simple; if $A \subset B$ is projective and finite and $K \subset L$ is a simple algebraic field extension; or if A is integrally closed. Furthermore, d is semicontinuous if A is noetherian of dimension 1 and with finite integral closure. In general, however, d is neither sub-multiplicative nor upper-semicontinuous.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $A \subset B$ be an integral ring extension, where A and B are two integral domains with fields of fractions $K = Q(A)$ and $L = Q(B)$, respectively. Then, for any element $b \in B$, there exist $n \geq 1$ and $a_i \in A$, such that

$$b^n + a_1 b^{n-1} + a_2 b^{n-2} + \dots + a_{n-1} b + a_n = 0.$$

The minimum integer $n \geq 1$ satisfying such an equation is called the *integral degree of b over A* and is denoted by $\text{id}_A(b)$. The supremum, possibly infinite, of all the integral degrees of elements of B over A , $\sup\{\text{id}_A(b) \mid b \in B\}$, is called the *integral degree of B over A* and is denoted by $d_A(B)$.

These concepts were explicitly introduced in [3]. The purpose there was to study the uniform Artin-Rees property with respect to the set of regular ideals having a principal reduction. It was proved that the integral degree, in fact, provides a uniform Artin-Rees number for such set of ideals.

The purpose of the present paper is to investigate more deeply the invariant $d_A(B)$. We first note that $d_A(B)$ is, as it were, halfway between $d_K(L)$, the integral degree of the corresponding algebraic field extension $K \subset L$, and $\mu_A(B)$, the minimal number of generators of the A -module B . That is,

$$d_K(L) \leq d_A(B) \leq \mu_A(B).$$

In a sense, $d_A(B)$ can play the role of, or just substitute for, one of them. For instance, it is a central question in commutative ring theory whether the integral closure $\overline{A}$ of a domain A is a finitely generated A -module. It is well-known that, for one-dimensional noetherian local domains, $\mu_A(\overline{A})$ might be infinite, contrary to $d_A(\overline{A})$, which is finite. Hence, in this situation, $d_A(B)$ would be an appropriate substitute for $\mu_A(B)$. Another positive aspect of $d_A(B)$, compared with $\mu_A(B)$, is good behaviour with respect to inclusion, i.e., if $B_1 \subset B_2$, then $d_A(B_1) \leq d_A(B_2)$, while in general we cannot deduce that $\mu_A(B_1)$ is smaller than or equal to $\mu_A(B_2)$.

Similarly, $d_K(L)$ is a simplification of $d_A(B)$. Note that $d_K(L)$ is closely related to $[L : K]$, the degree of the algebraic field extension $K \subset L$. We will see that $d_K(L) = [L : K]$ if and only if $K \subset L$ is a simple algebraic field extension. Of special interest would be to completely characterise when $d_A(B)$ reaches its maximal or its minimal value. Examples of maximal integral degree, i.e., $d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$, are simple integral extensions $A \subset B = A[b]$, $b \in B$. Examples of minimal integral degree, that is, $d_K(L) = d_A(B)$, occur when A is integrally closed or when $A \subset B$ is a projective

finite integral ring extension with corresponding simple algebraic field extension $K \subset L$; by a projective finite ring extension $A \subset B$ we mean that B is a finitely generated projective A -module. Moreover, integral ring extensions $A \subset B$ of both at the same time minimal and maximal integral degree are precisely free finite integral ring extensions $A \subset B$ with corresponding simple algebraic field extension $K \subset L$.

Considering the multiplicativity property of the degree of algebraic field extensions $K \subset L \subset M$, that is, $[M : K] = [L : K][M : L]$, and the sub-multiplicativity property of the minimal number of generators of integral ring extensions $A \subset B \subset C$, namely, $\mu_A(C) \leq \mu_A(B)\mu_B(C)$, it is natural to ask for the same property of $d_A(B)$. We will say that the integral degree d is *sub-multiplicative with respect to* $A \subset B$ if $d_A(C) \leq d_A(B)d_B(C)$, for every integral ring extension $B \subset C$. We prove that d is sub-multiplicative with respect to $A \subset B$ in the following three situations: if $A \subset B$ is of maximal integral degree; if $A \subset B$ is projective and finite and $K \subset L$ is simple; or if A is integrally closed (see Corollaries 3.4, 5.5 and 6.5). However, d is not sub-multiplicative in general. Taking advantage of an example of Dedekind, we find a non-integrally closed noetherian domain A of dimension 1, with finite integral closure B , where B is the ring of integers of a number field, and a degree-two integral extension C of B , such that $d_A(C) = 6$, whereas $d_A(B) = 2$ and $d_B(C) = 2$ (see Example 6.6).

Another aspect well worth considering is semicontinuity, taking into account that the minimal number of generators is an upper-semicontinuous function (see, e.g., [7, Chapter IV, § 2, Corollary 2.6]). Note that if $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal of A , clearly $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset B_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is integral. Thus one can regard the integral degree as a function $d : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, defined by $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}})$. We will say that the integral degree d is *upper-semicontinuous with respect to* $A \subset B$ if $d : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is an upper-semicontinuous function, that is, if $\{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid d(\mathfrak{p}) < n\}$ is open, for all $n \geq 1$. We prove that d is upper-semicontinuous with respect to $A \subset B$ in the following three situations: if $A \subset B$ is simple; if $A \subset B$ is projective and finite and $K \subset L$ is simple; or if A is integrally closed (see Proposition 7.1). However, in the three cases above, $d_A(B)$ is either of minimal integral degree, or else of maximal integral degree (see Proposition 2.3, Theorem 5.2 and Proposition 6.1). There is a setting in which we can prove that d is upper-semicontinuous with respect to $A \subset B$, yet $d_A(B)$ might be different from $d_K(L)$ and $\mu_A(B)$. This happens when A is a non-integrally closed noetherian domain of dimension 1 with finite integral closure (see Theorem 7.2). However, d is not upper-semicontinuous in general, even if A is a noetherian domain of dimension 1 (see Example 7.4).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall some definitions and known results given in [3]. We also prove that $d_A(B)$ is a local invariant in the following sense:

$$d_A(B) = \sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}}) \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(A)\} = \sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)\}.$$

Observe that the analogue for $\mu_A(B)$ is not true in general. Section 3 is mainly devoted to the sub-multiplicativity of the integral degree. Sections 4, 5 and 6 are devoted to the integral degree of, respectively, algebraic field extensions, projective finite ring extensions and integral ring extensions with base ring integrally closed. Finally, Section 7 is devoted to the upper-semicontinuity of the integral degree.

Notations and conventions. All rings will be assumed to be commutative and with unity. Throughout, $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ will be integral ring extensions. Moreover, we will always assume that A , B and C are integral domains, though many definitions and results can easily be extended to the non-integral domain case. The fields of fractions of A , B and C will be denoted by $K = Q(A)$, $L = Q(B)$ and $M = Q(C)$, respectively. The integral closure of A in $K = Q(A)$ will be denoted by $\overline{A}$ and will be simply called the “integral closure of A ”. In the particular case in which A , B and C are fields, we will write $A = K$, $B = L$ and $C = M$. The minimal number of generators of an A -module N , understood as the minimum of the cardinalities of generating sets of N , will be denoted by $\mu_A(N)$.

2. PRELIMINARIES AND FIRST PROPERTIES

We start by recalling and extending some definitions and results from [3, Section 6]. Recall that $A \subset B$ is an integral ring extension of integral domains, and $K = Q(A)$ and $L = Q(B)$ are their fields of fractions.

Definition 2.1. Let $b \in B$. A *minimal degree polynomial* of b over A (which is not necessarily unique) is a monic polynomial $m(T) = T^n + a_1 T^{n-1} + \dots + a_{n-1} T + a_n \in A[T]$, $n \geq 1$, with $m(b) = 0$, and such that there is no other monic polynomial of lower degree in $A[T]$ and vanishing at b . The *integral degree of b over A* , denoted by $\text{id}_A(b)$, is the degree of a minimal degree polynomial $m(T)$ of b over A . In other words,

$$\text{id}_A(b) = \deg m(T) = \min\{n \geq 1 \mid b \text{ satisfies an integral equation over } A \text{ of degree } n\}.$$

The *integral degree of B over A* is defined as the value (possibly infinite)

$$d_A(B) = \sup \{\text{id}_A(b) \mid b \in B\}.$$

Note that $d_A(B) = 1$ if and only if $A = B$.

We give a first example, which will be completed subsequently (see Corollary 5.6).

Example 2.2. Let B be an integral domain and let G be a finite group acting as automorphisms on B . Let $A = B^G = \{b \in B \mid \sigma(b) = b, \text{ for all } \sigma \in G\}$. Then $A \subset B$ is an integral ring extension and $d_A(B) \leq o(G)$, the order of G .

Proof. Let $G = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$. For every $b \in B$, take $p(T) = (T - \sigma_1(b)) \cdots (T - \sigma_n(b))$. Clearly $p(T) \in A[T]$ and $p(b) = 0$. Thus b is integral over A and $\text{id}_A(b) \leq n = o(G)$. $\square$

The following is a first list of properties of the integral degree mainly proved in [3].

Proposition 2.3. Let $A \subset B$ be an integral ring extension. The following properties hold.

- (a) $d_A(B) \leq \mu_A(B)$.
- (b) If $A \subset B = A[b]$ is simple, then $\text{id}_A(b) = d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$.
- (c) If S is a multiplicatively closed subset of A , then $S^{-1}A \subset S^{-1}B$ is an integral ring extension and $d_{S^{-1}A}(S^{-1}B) \leq d_A(B)$.
- (d) If $S = A \setminus \{0\}$, then $S^{-1}B = L$.
- (e) $d_K(L) \leq d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \leq d_A(B)$, for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)$.
- (f) $d_K(L) \leq [L : K]$.

Proof. (a), (b) and (c) can be found in [3, Corollary 6.3, Corollary 6.2 and Proposition 6.8]. Since $K = S^{-1}A \subset S^{-1}B$ is an integral ring extension, then $S^{-1}B$ is a zero-dimensional domain, hence a field, lying inside $L = Q(B)$. Thus $S^{-1}B = L$. Take $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)$, so $A \setminus \mathfrak{p} \subseteq S$. Since $A \subset B$ is an integral ring extension, then $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset B_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $K = S^{-1}A = (A_{\mathfrak{p}} \setminus \{0\})^{-1}A_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset (A_{\mathfrak{p}} \setminus \{0\})^{-1}B_{\mathfrak{p}} = S^{-1}B = L$ are integral ring extensions. Applying (c) twice, we get (e). Finally, applying (d) and (a), one has $d_K(L) = d_{S^{-1}A}(S^{-1}B) \leq \mu_{S^{-1}A}(S^{-1}B) = \mu_K(L) = [L : K]$. $\square$

Notation 2.4. The following picture can help in reading the paper.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} d_K(L) & \leq & d_A(B) \\ \mid \wedge & & \mid \wedge \\ [L : K] & \leq & \mu_A(B). \end{array}$$

We will say that $A \subset B$ has *minimal integral degree* (respectively, *maximal integral degree*), when $d_K(L) = d_A(B)$ (respectively, when $d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$).

Remark 2.5. By Proposition 2.3, “ $A \subset B$ simple implies $A \subset B$ has maximal integral degree”. We will see that the converse is true for finite field extensions (see Proposition 4.1). However, in general, $A \subset B$ of maximal integral degree does not imply $A \subset B$ simple. Take for instance $A = \mathbb{Z}$ and B the ring of integers of an algebraic number field L , i.e., B is the integral closure of $A = \mathbb{Z}$

in L , a finite field extension of the field of rational numbers $K = \mathbb{Q}$. Then $d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$ (see Corollary 5.7). Nevertheless, not every ring of integers B is a simple extension of $A = \mathbb{Z}$. We will take advantage of this fact in Example 6.6.

Clearly, there are integral ring extensions of non-maximal integral degree. This can already happen with affine domains, as shown in the next example.

Example 2.6. Let k be a field and t a variable over k . Let $A = k[t^3, t^8, t^{10}]$ and $B = k[t^3, t^4, t^5]$. Then $A \subset B$ is a finite ring extension with $d_A(B) = 2$ and $\mu_A(B) = 3$.

Proof. Since $k[t^3] \subset A$, then $B = \langle 1, t^4, t^5 \rangle_A$ and $A \subset B$ is a finite ring extension with $\mu_A(B) \leq 3$. If $x = a + bt^4 + ct^5 \in B$, with $a, b, c \in A$, then $x^2 - 2ax \in A$. Therefore $d_A(B) = 2$. Let us see that $\mu_A(B) = 3$. Suppose that there exist $f, g \in B$ such that $B = \langle f, g \rangle_A$, i.e., $1, t^4, t^5 \in \langle f, g \rangle_A$. Write $f = a_0 + t^3 f_1$ and $g = b_0 + t^3 g_1$, with $a_0, b_0 \in k$ and $f_1, g_1 \in k[t]$. Since $1 \in \langle f, g \rangle_A$, one can suppose that $a_0 = 1$ and $b_0 = 0$. Thus $f = 1 + a_3 t^3 + a_4 t^4 + a_5 t^5 + \dots$ and $g = b_3 t^3 + b_4 t^4 + b_5 t^5 + \dots$. In particular, every element of $\langle f, g \rangle_A$ is of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} &(\lambda_0 + \lambda_3 t^3 + \lambda_6 t^6 + \lambda_8 t^8 + \dots)(1 + a_3 t^3 + a_4 t^4 + a_5 t^5 + \dots) + \\ &(\mu_0 + \mu_3 t^3 + \mu_6 t^6 + \mu_8 t^8 + \dots)(b_3 t^3 + b_4 t^4 + b_5 t^5 + \dots) = \\ &(\lambda_0) + (\lambda_3 + \lambda_0 a_3 + \mu_0 b_3) t^3 + (\lambda_0 a_4 + \mu_0 b_4) t^4 + (\lambda_0 a_5 + \mu_0 b_5) t^5 + \dots \end{aligned}$$

From $t^4 \in \langle f, g \rangle_A$, one deduces that $(\lambda_0 = 0 \text{ and } b_4 \neq 0)$. Hence, one can suppose that $a_4 = 0$. From $1 \in \langle f, g \rangle_A$, it follows that $(\lambda_0 = 1, \mu_0 = 0 \text{ and } a_5 = 0)$. From $t^4 \in \langle f, g \rangle_A$ again, now it follows $b_5 = 0$. But from $t^5 \in \langle f, g \rangle_A$, one must have $b_5 \neq 0$, a contradiction. Hence $\mu_A(B) = 3$. $\square$

Remark 2.7. In the example above $K = L$ and so $A \subset B$ does not have minimal integral degree. We will prove that if A is integrally closed, then $A \subset B$ has minimal integral degree (see Proposition 6.1).

As for the finiteness of the integral degree, we recall the following.

Remark 2.8. There exist one dimensional noetherian local domains A with integral closure $\overline{A}$ such that $d_A(\overline{A})$ is finite while $\mu_A(\overline{A})$ is infinite (see [3, Proposition 6.5]). There exist one-dimensional noetherian domains A such that $d_A(\overline{A})$ is infinite (see [3, Example 6.6]).

Next we prove that the integral degree coincides with the supremum of the integral degrees of the localizations. (The analogue for $\mu_A(B)$ is not true in general.)

Proposition 2.9. *Let $A \subset B$ be an integral ring extension. For any $b \in B$, there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(A)$ such that $\text{id}_A(b) = \text{id}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(b/1)$. In particular,*

$$d_A(B) = \sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}}) \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(A)\} = \sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)\}.$$

Furthermore, if $d_A(B)$ is finite, then there exists $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(A)$ such that $d_A(B) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}})$.

Proof. If $\text{id}_A(b) = 1$, then $b \in A$. Thus, for any $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(A)$, $b/1 \in A_{\mathfrak{m}}$, so $\text{id}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(b/1) = 1$ and $\text{id}_A(b) = \text{id}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(b/1)$. Suppose that $\text{id}_A(b) = n \geq 2$. Then

$$A[b]/\langle 1, b, \dots, b^{n-2} \rangle \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A[b]/\langle 1, b, \dots, b^{n-1} \rangle = 0.$$

Clearly, for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)$, and for every $m \geq 1$,

$$(A[b]/\langle 1, b, \dots, b^m \rangle)_{\mathfrak{p}} = A_{\mathfrak{p}}[b/1]/\langle 1, b/1, \dots, b^m/1 \rangle.$$

In particular, $A_{\mathfrak{p}}[b/1]/\langle 1, b/1, \dots, b^{n-1}/1 \rangle = 0$, for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)$. Since $A[b]/\langle 1, b, \dots, b^{n-2} \rangle \neq 0$, then there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(A)$ with

$$A_{\mathfrak{m}}[b/1]/\langle 1, b/1, \dots, b^{n-2}/1 \rangle \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A_{\mathfrak{m}}[b/1]/\langle 1, b/1, \dots, b^{n-1}/1 \rangle = 0.$$

Therefore, $\text{id}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(b/1) = n$ and $\text{id}_A(b) = \text{id}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(b/1)$. In particular,

$$d_A(B) \leq \sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}}) \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(A)\} \leq \sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)\}.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.3, $\sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)\} \leq d_A(B)$. Finally, if $d_A(B)$ is finite, then there exists $b \in B$ such that $\text{id}_A(b) = d_A(B)$. We have just shown above that there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max}(A)$ with $\text{id}_A(b) = \text{id}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(b/1)$. Therefore

$$d_A(B) = \text{id}_A(b) = \text{id}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(b/1) \leq d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}}) \leq d_A(B)$$

and the equality holds. $\square$

Remark 2.10. Suppose that $A \subset B$ is finite. Since A is a domain, by generic flatness, there exists $f \in A \setminus \{0\}$ such that $A_f \subset B_f$ is a finite free extension (see, e.g., [8, Theorem 22.A]). In particular, for every $\mathfrak{p} \in D(f) = \text{Spec}(A) \setminus V(f)$, $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset B_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a finite free ring extension. So $d_A(B) = \max\{d_1, d_2\}$, where $d_1 = \sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in V(f)\}$ and $d_2 = \sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mid A_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset B_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ is free}\}$. Therefore, if one is able to control the integral degree for finite free ring extensions, the calculation of $d_A(B)$ is reduced to find $d_1 = \sup\{d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in V(f)\}$, where $V(f)$ is a proper closed set of $\text{Spec}(A)$. We will come back to this question in Theorem 5.3.

3. SUB-MULTIPLICATIVITY

In this section we study the sub-multiplicativity of the integral degree with respect to $A \subset B$, i.e., whether $d_A(C) \leq d_A(B)d_B(C)$ holds for every integral ring extension $B \subset C$. Observe that, in this situation, $A \subset C$ is an integral ring extension too and, by definition, $d_B(C) \leq d_A(C)$. We start with a useful criterion to determine possible bounds $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ in the inequality $d_A(C) \leq \nu d_B(C)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ be two integral ring extensions. Set $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$. The following conditions are equivalent.*

- (i) $d_A(D) \leq \nu d_B(D)$, for every ring D such that $B \subseteq D \subseteq C$;
- (ii) $d_A(D) \leq \nu d_B(D)$, for every ring D such that $D = B[\alpha]$ for some $\alpha \in C$;
- (iii) $\text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq \nu \text{id}_B(\alpha)$, for every element $\alpha \in C$.

In particular, if (iii) holds, then $d_A(C) \leq \nu d_B(C)$.

Proof. Clearly, (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii). Let $\alpha \in C$; in particular, α is integral over A . Since $A[\alpha] \subset B[\alpha]$, then $\text{id}_A(\alpha) = d_A(A[\alpha]) \leq d_A(B[\alpha])$. By hypothesis (ii), $d_A(B[\alpha]) \leq \nu d_B(B[\alpha]) = \nu \text{id}_B(\alpha)$. Therefore, $\text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq \nu \text{id}_B(\alpha)$, which proves (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii). To see (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i), take D with $B \subseteq D \subseteq C$ and $\alpha \in D$, which will be integral over B and, hence, integral over A . By hypothesis (iii), $\text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq \nu \text{id}_B(\alpha) \leq \nu d_B(D)$. Taking supremum over all $\alpha \in D$, $d_A(D) \leq \nu d_B(D)$.

Finally, if (iii) holds, then (i) holds for $D = C$, so $d_A(C) \leq \nu d_B(C)$. $\square$

The next result shows that we can take $\nu = \mu_A(B)$ as a particular $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, understanding that if $A \subset B$ is not finite, then $\mu_A(B) = \infty$ and the inequality is trivial.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ be two integral ring extensions. Then, for every $\alpha \in C$,*

$$\text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq \mu_A(B) \text{id}_B(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad d_A(C) \leq \mu_A(B) d_B(C).$$

Proof. Let $\alpha \in C$, which is integral over B and A . Then

$$\text{id}_A(\alpha) = d_A(A[\alpha]) \leq d_A(B[\alpha]) \leq \mu_A(B[\alpha]) \leq \mu_A(B) \mu_B(B[\alpha]) = \mu_A(B) \text{id}_B(\alpha).$$

To finish, apply Lemma 3.1. $\square$

Remark 3.3. A proof of Theorem 3.2 using the standard “determinantal trick” would be as follows. Suppose $B = \langle b_1, \dots, b_n \rangle_A$, with $\mu_A(B) = n$, and consider $\alpha \in C$ with $\text{id}_B(\alpha) = m$. Let X be the following $nm \times 1$ vector, whose entries form an A -module generating set of $B[\alpha]$,

$$X^{\top} = (1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{m-1}, b_1, b_1\alpha, \dots, b_1\alpha^{m-1}, \dots, b_n, b_n\alpha, \dots, b_n\alpha^{m-1}).$$

Then there exists a nm square matrix P with coefficients in A , such that $\alpha X = PX$. Therefore, $(\alpha I - P)X = 0$. Multiplying by the adjoint matrix leads to $Q_P(\alpha) = \det(\alpha I - P) = 0$, where $Q_P(T)$ is the characteristic polynomial of P (recall that C is a domain). Hence $\text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq \deg Q_P(T) = nm = \mu_A(B) \text{id}_B(\alpha)$.

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.2, we obtain the sub-multiplicativity of the integral degree with respect to integral ring extensions of maximal integral degree.

Corollary 3.4. *Let $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ be two integral ring extensions. If $d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$, then*

$$d_A(C) \leq d_A(B)d_B(C).$$

To finish this section we recover part of a result shown in [3], but now with a slightly different proof.

Corollary 3.5. ([3, Proposition 6.7]) *Let $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ be two integral ring extensions. Then, for every $\alpha \in C$,*

$$\text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq d_A(B)^{d_B(C)} \text{id}_B(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad d_A(C) \leq d_A(B)^{d_B(C)} d_B(C).$$

In particular, if $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ have finite integral degrees, then $A \subset C$ has finite integral degree.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in C$; in particular, α is integral over B and over A . Let $m(T)$ be a minimal degree polynomial of α over B , $m(T) = T^n + b_1 T^{n-1} + \dots + b_n \in B[T]$, so that $n = \text{id}_B(\alpha) \leq d_B(C)$. Set $E = A[b_1, \dots, b_n]$, where $A \subseteq E \subseteq B$. Therefore,

$$\text{id}_A(\alpha) = d_A(A[\alpha]) \leq d_A(E[\alpha]) \leq \mu_A(E[\alpha]) \leq \mu_A(E)\mu_E(E[\alpha]),$$

where clearly $\mu_A(E) \leq \prod_{i=1}^n \text{id}_A(b_i) \leq d_A(B)^{d_B(C)}$, and $\mu_E(E[\alpha]) = \text{id}_E(\alpha) = \text{id}_B(\alpha)$. To finish, apply Lemma 3.1. $\square$

4. INTEGRAL DEGREE OF ALGEBRAIC FIELD EXTENSIONS

In this section, we suppose that $A = K$, $B = L$ and $C = M$ are fields. Our first result characterizes simple finite field extensions as finite field extensions of maximal integral degree. Recall that a finite separable field extension is simple. Even more, a simple algebraic field extension of a finite separable field extension is again simple (this follows from the “extended” primitive element theorem; see, e.g., [5, III, Chapter I, § 11, Theorem 14]).

Proposition 4.1. *Let $K \subset L$ be a finite field extension. Then $K \subset L$ is simple if and only if $d_K(L) = [L : K]$.*

Proof. For any $\alpha \in L$, $[L : K] = [L : K(\alpha)][K(\alpha) : K] = [L : K(\alpha)]d_K(K(\alpha))$ (see Proposition 2.3). If $K \subset L$ is simple, then, for some $\alpha \in L$, $K(\alpha) = L$. Thus $[L : K(\alpha)] = 1$ and $d_K(L) = [L : K]$. Conversely, if $d_K(L) = [L : K]$, then, by definition, there exists $\alpha \in L$ with $\text{id}_K(\alpha) = [L : K]$. By Proposition 2.3, $[L : K] = \text{id}_K(\alpha) = d_K(K(\alpha)) = [K(\alpha) : K]$. It follows that $[L : K(\alpha)] = 1$ and $K \subset L$ is simple. $\square$

Proposition 4.2. *Let $K \subset L$ be a finite purely inseparable field extension. Let p be the characteristic of K , let h be the height of $K \subset L$ and e be the exponent of $K \subset L$. Then*

$$d_K(L) = p^h \leq p^e = [L : K].$$

Proof. This follows from the definition of $d_K(L)$ and, e.g., [1, Chapter V, § 5]. $\square$

Here there is an example of a finite field extension of non maximal integral degree.

Example 4.3. Let $p > 1$ be a prime and $K = \mathbb{F}_p(u_1^p, u_2^p)$, where u_1, u_2 are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{F}_p$. Set $L = K[u_1, u_2]$. Then $K \subset L$ is a finite purely inseparable field extension of height $h = 1$. Hence $d_K(L) = p$. However $[L : K] = p^2$.

Proof. Any $\beta \in L$ is of the form $\beta = \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq p-1} a_{i,j} u_1^i u_2^j$, with $a_{i,j} \in K$. So

$$\beta^p = \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq p-1} a_{i,j}^p u_1^{ip} u_2^{jp} = \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq p-1} a_{i,j}^p (u_1^p)^i (u_2^p)^j,$$

which is an element of K . Therefore $\beta^p \in K$ and $\text{id}_K(\beta) \leq p$. Since $\text{id}_K(u_1) = p$, it follows that $d_K(L) = p$. Since $K \subsetneq K(u_1) \subsetneq L$ are finite field extensions, each one of degree p , by the multiplicative formula for algebraic field extensions, $[L : K] = [L : K(u_1)][K(u_1) : K] = p^2$. $\square$

Proposition 4.4. *Let $K \subset L$ be a finite field extension. Let K_s be the separable closure of K in L . Then*

$$d_K(L) = d_K(K_s)d_{K_s}(L).$$

Proof. Applying Corollary 3.4 to the simple extension $K \subset K_s$, we have $d_K(L) \leq d_K(K_s)d_{K_s}(L)$. To see the other inequality, take $\alpha \in L$ with $\text{id}_{K_s}(\alpha) = d_{K_s}(L)$. By the extended primitive element theorem, $K \subset K_s[\alpha]$ is a simple algebraic field extension (see, e.g., [5, III, Chapter I, § 11, Theorem 14]). By Propositions 4.1 and 2.3,

$$d_K(K_s)d_{K_s}(L) = [K_s : K]\text{id}_{K_s}(\alpha) = [K_s : K]\mu_{K_s}(K_s[\alpha]) = [K_s[\alpha] : K] = d_K(K_s[\alpha]) \leq d_K(L).$$

$\square$

Remark 4.5. For finite field extensions, the integral degree lies between the separable degree and the algebraic degree, and both are multiplicative. Concretely, if $K \subset L$ is a finite field extension, then $[L : K]_s \leq d_K(L) \leq [L : K]$. Moreover, $[L : K]_s$ divides $d_K(L)$ since $d_K(L) = [L : K]_s d_{K_s}(L)$, and $d_K(L)$ divides $[L : K]$ since $[L : K] = d_K(L)p^{e-h}$ (see Propositions 4.4 and 4.2).

Now we prove the sub-multiplicativity of the integral degree with respect to an algebraic field extension $K \subset L$.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $K \subset L$ and $L \subset M$ be two algebraic field extensions. Then, for every $\alpha \in M$,*

$$\text{id}_K(\alpha) \leq d_K(L)\text{id}_L(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad d_K(M) \leq d_K(L)d_L(M).$$

Proof. We can assume that $d_K(L)$ and $d_L(M)$ are finite.

Let $\alpha \in M$ and let $m(T) = T^n + b_1T^{n-1} + \dots + b_n \in L[T]$ be a minimal degree polynomial of α over L . Let h be the height of the purely inseparable field extension $K_s \subset L$, where K_s is the separable closure of K in L . Let $p = \text{char}(K)$. If K has characteristic 0, we understand that $p^h = 1$. Then $0 = m(\alpha)^{p^h} = \alpha^{np^h} + b_1^{p^h}\alpha^{(n-1)p^h} + \dots + b_n^{p^h}$. It follows that α is a root of a monic polynomial in $K_s[T]$ of degree $p^h \text{id}_L(\alpha)$. So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{id}_K(\alpha) &= d_K(K[\alpha]) \leq d_K(K_s[\alpha]) \leq \mu_K(K_s[\alpha]) \leq \mu_K(K_s) \cdot \mu_{K_s}(K_s[\alpha]) = \\ &= d_K(K_s) \cdot \text{id}_{K_s}(\alpha) \leq d_K(K_s)p^h \text{id}_L(\alpha) = d_K(L)\text{id}_L(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

To finish, apply Lemma 3.1. $\square$

Though sub-multiplicative, the integral degree might not be multiplicative, even for two simple algebraic field extensions.

Example 4.7. Let $p > 1$ be a prime and let $K = \mathbb{F}_p(u_1^p, u_2^p)$, where u_1, u_2 are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{F}_p$. Set $L = K[u_1]$ and $M = L[u_2]$. Then $K \subset L$ and $L \subset M$ are two finite field extensions with $d_K(M) = p$ and $d_K(L)d_L(M) = \text{id}_K(u_1)\text{id}_L(u_2) = p^2$ (see Example 4.3 and Proposition 2.3).

However, for finite separable field extensions, multiplicativity holds.

Remark 4.8. Let $K \subset L$ be a finite separable field extension and $L \subset M$ be a simple algebraic field extension. Then

$$d_K(M) = d_K(L)d_L(M).$$

Proof. By the extended primitive element theorem, $K \subset M$ is a simple. Hence, by Proposition 4.1, $d_K(M) = [M : K]$, $d_K(L) = [L : K]$ and $d_L(M) = [M : L]$. $\square$

5. INTEGRAL DEGREE OF PROJECTIVE FINITE RING EXTENSIONS

We return to the general hypotheses: $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ are integral ring extensions of integral domains, and K , L and M are their fields of fractions, respectively. In this section we are interested in the integral degree of projective finite ring extensions (by a projective ring extension $A \subset B$ we understand that B is a projective A -module). We begin by recalling some well-known definitions and facts (see, e.g., [7, Chapter IV, § 2, 3]).

Reminder 5.1. Let A be a domain and let N be a finitely generated A -module.

- N is a free A -module if it has a basis, i.e., a linearly independent system of generators. The *rank of a free module* N , $\text{rank}_A(N)$, is defined as the cardinality of (indeed, any) a basis. Clearly, N is free of rank n if and only if $N \cong A^n$. If N is a free A -module, the minimal generating sets are just the bases of N . In particular, $\mu_A(N) = \text{rank}_A(N)$.
- N is a projective A -module if there exists an A -module N' such that $N \oplus N'$ is free. One has that N is projective if and only if N is finitely presentable and locally free. The *rank of a projective module* N at a prime $\mathfrak{p}$, $\text{rank}_{\mathfrak{p}}(N)$, is defined as the rank of the free $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -module $N_{\mathfrak{p}}$, i.e., $\text{rank}_{\mathfrak{p}}(N) = \text{rank}_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(N_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \mu_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(N_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \dim_{k(\mathfrak{p})}(N \otimes k(\mathfrak{p}))$, where $k(\mathfrak{p}) = A_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ stands for the residue field of A at $\mathfrak{p}$.
- If N is projective, then $\mathfrak{p} \mapsto \text{rank}_{\mathfrak{p}}(N)$ is constant (recall that A is a domain) and is simply denoted by $\text{rank}_A(N)$. In particular, on taking the prime ideal (0) , then $\text{rank}_A(N) = \mu_K(N \otimes K) = \text{rank}_{\mathfrak{p}}(N)$, for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$. Clearly, when N is free both definitions of rank coincide.

Theorem 5.2. Let $A \subset B$ be a projective finite ring extension. Then

$$d_K(L) \leq d_A(B) \leq \text{rank}_A(B) = [L : K].$$

If moreover $K \subset L$ is simple, then

$$d_K(L) = d_A(B) = \text{rank}_A(B) = [L : K].$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.9, there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of A such that $d_A(B) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}})$. By Proposition 2.3 and using that $B_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is $A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -free and B is A -projective, then

$$d_K(L) \leq d_A(B) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}}) \leq \mu_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \text{rank}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \text{rank}_A(B) = \mu_K(B \otimes K) = [L : K].$$

To finish, recall that if $K \subset L$ is simple, then $d_K(L) = [L : K]$ (see Proposition 2.3 or 4.1). $\square$

The next result characterizes finite ring extensions of maximal and minimal integral degree at the same time.

Corollary 5.3. Let $A \subset B$ be a finite ring extension.

- (a) $A \subset B$ is free if and only if $[L : K] = \mu_A(B)$.
- (b) $A \subset B$ is free and $K \subset L$ is simple if and only if $d_K(L) = d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$.

Proof. If $A \subset B$ is free, then $\mu_A(B) = \text{rank}_A(B) = [L : K]$ (see Reminder 5.1 and Theorem 5.2). Reciprocally, suppose that $[L : K] = \mu_A(B)$. Set $\mu_A(B) = n$ and let $u_1, \dots, u_n$ be a system of generators of the A -module B . Thus, $u_1, \dots, u_n$ is a system of generators of the K -module L , where $n = [L : K]$ (recall that, if $S = A \setminus \{0\}$, then $K = S^{-1}A$ and $L = S^{-1}B$, cf. Proposition 2.3). Hence, they are a K -basis of L , so K -linearly independent. In particular, $u_1, \dots, u_n$ are A -linearly independent. Since they also generate B , one concludes that $u_1, \dots, u_n$ is an A -basis of B and that B is a free A -module. This shows (a). Since $d_K(L) \leq d_A(B) \leq \mu_A(B)$ and $d_K(L) \leq [L : K] \leq \mu_A(B)$ (see Notation 2.4), part (b) follows from part (a) and Proposition 4.1. $\square$

Corollary 5.4. Let $A \subset B = A[b]$ be a projective simple integral ring extension. Then $A \subset B$ is free and $1, b, \dots, b^{n-1}$ is a basis, where

$$n = \text{id}_A(b) = d_A(B) = \mu_A(B) \quad \text{and} \quad n = \text{id}_K(b/1) = d_K(L) = [L : K].$$

Proof. If $S = A \setminus \{0\}$, then $K = S^{-1}A$ and $L = S^{-1}B = S^{-1}A[b] = K[b/1]$. Thus $K \subset L = K[b/1]$ is a simple algebraic field extension. By Proposition 2.3, $\text{id}_A(b) = d_A(B) = \mu_A(B) = n$, say, and $\text{id}_K(b/1) = d_K(L) = [L : K] = m$, say. By Theorem 5.2 and Corollary 5.3, $n = m$ and $A \subset B$ is free (see Corollary 5.3). Since $\{1, b, \dots, b^{n-1}\}$ is a minimal system of generators of $B = A[b]$, then it is a basis of the free A -module B (see Reminder 5.1). $\square$

Sub-multiplicativity holds in the case of projective finite ring extensions $A \subset B$ with $K \subset L$ being simple.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ be two finite ring extensions. If $A \subset B$ is projective and $K \subset L$ is simple, then*

$$d_A(C) \leq d_A(B)d_B(C).$$

If moreover, $K \subset L$ is separable, $B \subset C$ is projective and $L \subset M$ is simple, then

$$d_A(C) = d_A(B)d_B(C).$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.9, there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of A such that $d_A(C) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(C_{\mathfrak{m}})$. Since $A \subset B$ is projective, then $A_{\mathfrak{m}} \subset B_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is free with fields of fractions $Q(A_{\mathfrak{m}}) = Q(A) = K$ and $Q(B_{\mathfrak{m}}) = Q(B) = L$, respectively, where $K \subset L$ is simple by hypothesis. By Corollary 5.3, $d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \mu_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}})$. Therefore, by Corollary 3.4 and Proposition 2.3,

$$d_A(C) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(C_{\mathfrak{m}}) \leq d_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(B_{\mathfrak{m}})d_{B_{\mathfrak{m}}}(C_{\mathfrak{m}}) \leq d_A(B)d_B(C).$$

As for the second part of the statement, by hypothesis, $A \subset C$ is projective and $K \subset M$ is simple (again, we use the extended primitive element theorem). By Theorem 5.2, $d_K(L) = d_A(B)$, $d_L(M) = d_B(C)$ and $d_K(M) = d_A(C)$. By Remark 4.8, $d_K(M) = d_K(L)d_L(M)$, so $d_A(C) = d_A(B)d_B(C)$. $\square$

Now we can complement Example 2.2. Let $A \subset B$ a ring extension. Let G be a finite group acting as A -algebra automorphisms on B . Define B^G as the subring $B^G = \{b \in B \mid \sigma(b) = b, \text{ for all } \sigma \in G\}$. It is said that $A \subset B$ is a *Galois extension with group G* if $B^G = A$, and for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n}$ in B and any $\sigma \in G \setminus \{1\}$, there is a $b \in B$ such that $\sigma(b) - b \notin \mathfrak{n}$ (see, e.g., [6, Definition 4.2.1]).

Corollary 5.6. *Let G be a finite group and let $A \subset B$ be a Galois ring extension with group G . Then $A \subset B$ is a projective finite ring extension and $d_K(L) = d_A(B) = [L : K] = o(G)$.*

Proof. Since $A \subset B$ is a Galois ring extension of domains with group G , then $A \subset B$ is a projective finite ring extension, $K \subset L$ is a Galois field extension with group G and $[L : K] = o(G)$ (see, e.g., [6, Subsequent Remark to Definition 4.2.1 and Lemma 4.2.5]). In particular, $K \subset L$ is separable and hence simple. By Theorem 5.2, $d_K(L) = d_A(B) = [L : K] = o(G)$. $\square$

Next we calculate the integral degree when A is a Dedekind domain and $K \subset L$ is simple, for example, when B is the ring of integers of an algebraic number field (see Remark 2.5).

Corollary 5.7. *Let $A \subset B$ be a finite ring extension. Suppose that A is Dedekind and that $K \subset L$ is simple. Then $A \subset B$ is projective and $d_K(L) = d_A(B) = \text{rank}_A(B) = [L : K]$. If moreover A is a principal ideal domain, then $A \subset B$ is free and $d_K(L) = d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$.*

Proof. Since B is a torsion-free A -module and A is a Dedekind domain, then $A \subset B$ is a projective finite ring extension (see, e.g., [10, Corollary to Theorem 1.32, page 30]). Since $A \subset B$ is projective finite and $K \subset L$ is simple, then $d_K(L) = d_A(B) = \text{rank}_A(B) = [L : K]$ (see Theorem 5.2). Finally, if A is a principal ideal domain, then $A \subset B$ must be free and we apply Corollary 5.3. $\square$

6. INTEGRALLY CLOSED BASE RING

As always, $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ are integral ring extensions of domains, and K , L and M are their fields of fractions, respectively. Recall that $\overline{A}$ denotes the integral closure of A in K . In this section we focus our attention on the case where A is integrally closed. We begin by noting that, in such a situation, $A \subset B$ has minimal integral degree.

Proposition 6.1. *Let $A \subset B$ be an integral ring extension. Then, for every $b \in B$, $\text{id}_K(b) = \text{id}_{\overline{A}}(b)$. In particular, if A is integrally closed, then $d_K(L) = d_A(B)$.*

Proof. Since $K \supset \overline{A}$, $\text{id}_K(b) \leq \text{id}_{\overline{A}}(b)$. On the other hand, it is well-known that the minimal polynomial of b over K has coefficients in $\overline{A}$ (see, e.g., [2, Chapter V, § 1.3, Corollary to Proposition 11]), which forces $\text{id}_{\overline{A}}(b) \leq \text{id}_K(b)$. So $\text{id}_K(b) = \text{id}_{\overline{A}}(b)$.

Suppose now that A is integrally closed. Then, for every $b \in B$, $\text{id}_A(b) = \text{id}_{\overline{A}}(b) = \text{id}_K(b) \leq d_K(L)$. Thus $d_A(B) \leq d_K(L)$. The equality follows from Proposition 2.3. $\square$

Certainly, $\text{id}_{\overline{A}}(b)$ may not be equal to $\text{id}_A(b)$, as the next example shows.

Example 6.2. Let $A = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]$. Then $K = Q(A) = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-3})$. Let $b = (1 + \sqrt{-3})/2 \in K$. Clearly, b is integral over A , and the minimal polynomial of b over K is $T^2 - T + 1$. Thus $\text{id}_A(b) = 2$, whereas $\text{id}_K(b) = 1$.

As a consequence of the former proposition we obtain a well-known result, namely, a simple integral ring extension over an integrally closed domain is a free extension.

Corollary 6.3. *Let $A \subset B$ be a finite ring extension. Suppose that A is an integrally closed domain. Then, $d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$ is equivalent to $A \subset B$ free and $K \subset L$ simple. In particular, if $A \subset B$ is simple and A is integrally closed, then $A \subset B$ is free.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.1, one has $d_K(L) = d_A(B)$. Thus, $d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$ is equivalent to $d_K(L) = [L : K] = \mu_A(B)$ (see Notation 2.4). The latter is equivalent to $A \subset B$ free and $K \subset L$ simple (see Corollary 5.3). To finish apply Proposition 2.3. $\square$

Now, we return to the sub-multiplicativity question.

Theorem 6.4. *Let $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ be two integral ring extensions. Then, for every $\alpha \in C$,*

$$\text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq \mu_A(\overline{A})d_A(B)\text{id}_B(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad d_A(C) \leq \mu_A(\overline{A})d_A(B)d_B(C).$$

Proof. Let $\alpha \in C$. Consider the integral extensions $A \subset \overline{A}$ and $\overline{A} \subset \overline{A}[C]$, where $\overline{A}[C]$ stands for the $\overline{A}$ -algebra generated by the elements of C . By Theorem 3.2, $\text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq \mu_A(\overline{A})\text{id}_{\overline{A}}(\alpha)$. But, by Proposition 6.1, $\text{id}_{\overline{A}}(\alpha) = \text{id}_K(\alpha)$. On the other hand, applying Theorem 4.6 and Proposition 2.3, we have

$$\text{id}_K(\alpha) \leq d_K(L)\text{id}_L(\alpha) \leq d_A(B)\text{id}_B(\alpha).$$

Hence, $\text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq \mu_A(\overline{A})d_A(B)\text{id}_B(\alpha)$. By Lemma 3.1, we are done. $\square$

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 6.4, we get the sub-multiplicativity of the integral degree with respect to $A \subset B$ when A is integrally closed.

Corollary 6.5. *Let $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ be two integral ring extensions. Suppose that A is an integrally closed domain. Then*

$$d_A(C) \leq d_A(B)d_B(C).$$

However, in the non-integrally closed case, this formula may fail already for noetherian domains of dimension 1, as shown below. To see this, we take advantage of an example due to Dedekind of a non-monogenic number field L . Concretely, we consider B as the ring of integers of L and find A and C such that $d_A(C) > d_A(B)d_B(C)$.

Example 6.6. Let γ_1 be a root of the irreducible polynomial $T^3 - T^2 - 2T - 8 \in \mathbb{Q}[T]$. Let $L = \mathbb{Q}(\gamma_1)$. Let B be the integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in L (i.e., the ring of integers of L). Then

(a) B is a free $\mathbb{Z}$ -module with basis $\{1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$, where $\gamma_2 = (\gamma_1^2 + \gamma_1)/2$.

(b) $d_{\mathbb{Q}}(L) = d_{\mathbb{Z}}(B) = \mu_{\mathbb{Z}}(B) = 3$ and the extension $\mathbb{Z} \subset B$ is not simple (L is non-monogenic).

Let $A = \langle 1, 2\gamma_1, 2\gamma_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} = \{a + b\gamma_1 + c\gamma_2 \in B \mid a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}, b \equiv c \equiv 0 \pmod{2}\}$. Then

(c) A is a free $\mathbb{Z}$ -module and an integral domain with field of fractions $K = Q(A) = L$.

(d) B is the integral closure of A in L , $d_A(B) = 2$ and $\mu_A(B) = 3$.

Let $C = B[\alpha]$, where α is a root of $p(T) = T^2 + \gamma_1 T + (1 + \gamma_2) \in B[T]$. Then

(e) $B \subset C$ is an integral extension with $d_B(C) = 2$ and $d_A(C) = 6$.

In particular, $d_A(C) > d_A(B)d_B(C)$.

Proof. By Corollary 5.7, $\mathbb{Z} \subset B$ is free and $d_{\mathbb{Q}}(L) = d_{\mathbb{Z}}(B) = \mu_{\mathbb{Z}}(B)$. Moreover, since $\gamma_1 \in B$ with $\text{id}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\gamma_1) = 3$, then $d_{\mathbb{Z}}(B) \geq 3$. The proof that $\{1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of B and that $\mathbb{Z} \subset B$ is not simple is due to Dedekind (see, e.g., [10, p. 64]). This proves (a) and (b).

Note that, from the equalities

$$\gamma_1^2 = -\gamma_1 + 2\gamma_2, \quad \gamma_2^2 = 6 + 2\gamma_1 + 3\gamma_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_1\gamma_2 = 4 + 2\gamma_2,$$

the product in B can be immediately computed in terms of its $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis $\{1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$.

Clearly $\{1, 2\gamma_1, 2\gamma_2\}$ are $\mathbb{Z}$ -linearly independent. One can easily check that A is a ring and that $x^2 + x \in A$, for every $x \in B$. Hence, $A \subset B$ is an integral extension with $d_A(B) = 2$. Moreover, the field of fractions of A is $K = Q(A) = L$, and that the integral closure of A in K is B . Observe that $\mu_A(B) \leq \mu_{\mathbb{Z}}(B) = 3$. Below we will see that $\mu_A(B) = 3$.

An easy computation shows that:

(1) there exists $q(T) \in B[T]$, monic of degree n such that $p(T)q(T) \in A[T] \iff n \geq 4$.

Note that the existence of such a polynomial $q(T) = T^n + b_1 T^{n-1} + \dots + b_{n-1} T + b_n$ is equivalent to the solvability in $\mathbb{Z}$ modulo 2 of a certain system of linear equations with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ (in the unknowns $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $b_i = a_{i,1} + a_{i,2}\gamma_1 + a_{i,3}\gamma_2$).

It follows that $p(T) \in B[T]$ is irreducible in L . Indeed, suppose that $p(T) = (T - \beta_1)(T - \beta_2)$, with $\beta_i \in L$. Since $p(T) \in B[T]$, then β_i are integral over B . Thus, $\beta_i \in B$, $i = 1, 2$, because B is integrally closed in L . Since $d_A(B) = 2$, a minimal degree polynomial $h_i(T) \in A[T]$ of β_i over A has $\deg h_i(T) \leq 2$. Considering $h_i(T)$ in $L[T]$, then $h_i(T) = (T - \beta_i)q_i(T) \in L[T]$, with $q_i(T) \in L[T]$ monic and $\deg q_i(T) \leq 1$. Therefore, $q_i(T) \in B[T]$, because B is integrally closed in L (see, e.g., [2, Chapter V, § 1.3, Proposition 11]). Taking $q(T) = q_1(T)q_2(T)$, one would obtain $p(T)q(T) \in A[T]$ with $q(T) \in B[T]$, $q(T)$ monic and $\deg q(T) \leq 2$, a contradiction with (1). Thus, $p(T)$ is irreducible in L and, in particular, $d_B(C) = 2$.

Now take $h(T) \in A[T]$ a minimal degree polynomial of α over A . Since $p(T)$ is the irreducible polynomial of α over L , it follows that $h(T) = p(T)q(T)$, for some $q(T) \in L[T]$. Since B is integrally closed in L , then $q(T) \in B[T]$ (by the same reason as before). By (1), $\deg q(T) \geq 4$. Thus, $\text{id}_A(\alpha) \geq 6$. By Theorem 3.2, $6 \leq \text{id}_A(\alpha) \leq d_A(C) \leq \mu_A(B)d_B(C) \leq 6$. Hence $d_A(C) = 6$ and $\mu_A(B) = 3$. $\square$

7. UPPER-SEMICONINUITY

Recall that $A \subset B$ is an integral ring extension of integral domains, and $K = Q(A)$ and $L = Q(B)$ are their fields of fractions. Let $d : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be defined by $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}})$. In this section we study the upper-semicontinuity of d , that is, whether or not,

$$d^{-1}([n, +\infty)) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid d(\mathfrak{p}) \geq n\}$$

is a closed set for every $n \geq 1$. There are three cases in which upper-semicontinuity follows easily from our previous results.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $A \subset B$ be an integral ring extension. Then $d : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, defined by $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}})$, is upper-semicontinuous in any of the following cases:*

- (a) $A \subset B$ is simple;
- (b) $A \subset B$ is projective finite and $K \subset L$ is simple;
- (c) A is integrally closed.

Proof. If $A \subset B = A[b]$ is simple, then $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset B_{\mathfrak{p}} = A_{\mathfrak{p}}[b/1]$ is simple too, for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)$. By Proposition 2.3, it follows that $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \mu_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}})$. But the minimal number of generators is known to be an upper-semicontinuous function (see, e.g., [7, Chapter IV, § 2, Corollary 2.6]). This shows case (a). By Proposition 2.3, $d_K(L) \leq d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \leq d_A(B)$, for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)$. In case (b) or (c), $d_K(L) = d_A(B)$ (see Theorem 5.2 or Proposition 6.1). Hence, $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) = d_K(L)$ is constant, and thus upper-semicontinuous. $\square$

A possible way to weaken the integrally closed hypothesis is to shrink the conductor $\mathcal{C} = (A : \overline{A})$ of A in its integral closure $\overline{A}$. A first thought would be to suppose that $\mathcal{C}$ is of maximal height. However, with some extra assumptions on A , e.g., A local Cohen-Macaulay, analytically unramified and A not integrally closed, one can prove that the conductor must have height 1 (see, e.g., [4, Exercise 12.6]). In this sense, it seems appropriate to start by considering the case A of dimension 1.

Theorem 7.2. *Let $A \subset B$ be an integral ring extension. Suppose that A is a noetherian domain of dimension 1 and with finite integral closure (e.g., A is a Nagata ring). Then $d : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, defined by $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}})$, is upper-semicontinuous.*

Proof. If A is integrally closed, the result follows from Proposition 7.1. Thus we can suppose that A is not integrally closed. Since $\overline{A}$ is finitely generated as an A -module, then $\mathcal{C} = (A : \overline{A}) \neq 0$. Since A is a one dimensional domain, $\mathcal{C}$ has height 1 and any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ containing $\mathcal{C}$ must be minimal over it. Therefore, the closed set $V(\mathcal{C})$ coincides with the set of minimal primes over $\mathcal{C}$, so it is finite. Note that, for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)$, $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}}) \geq d_K(L)$ (see Proposition 2.3). Moreover, if $\mathfrak{p} \notin V(\mathcal{C})$, then $A_{\mathfrak{p}} = \overline{A}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_K(L)$ (see Proposition 6.1). Now, take $n \geq 1$. If $n > d_K(L)$, then $\{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid d(\mathfrak{p}) \geq n\} \subseteq V(\mathcal{C})$ is a finite set, hence a closed set. If $n \leq d_K(L)$, then $\{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid d(\mathfrak{p}) \geq n\} = \text{Spec}(A)$. Thus, for every $n \geq 1$, $d^{-1}([n, +\infty))$ is a closed set and $d : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is upper-semicontinuous. $\square$

Remark 7.3. Note that the proof of Theorem 7.2 only uses that $V(\mathcal{C})$ is a finite set of $\text{Spec}(A)$. For instance, it also holds if A is a noetherian local domain of dimension 2 and with finite integral closure $\overline{A}$. Another example where it would work would be the following: let A be the coordinate ring of a reduced and irreducible variety V over a field of characteristic zero. Then the conductor $\mathcal{C}$ contains the Jacobian ideal J . Now J defines the singular locus of V , so if we suppose that V has only isolated singularities, then J is of dimension zero, so $\mathcal{C}$ is of dimension zero also. Hence $V(\mathcal{C})$ is finite (see [4, Theorem 4.4.9] and [13, Corollary 6.4.1]).

If we skip the condition that $\overline{A}$ be finitely generated, the result may fail. The following example is inspired by [11, Example 1.4] (see also [3, Example 6.6.]).

Example 7.4. There exists a noetherian domain A of dimension 1 with $d_A(\overline{A}) = 2$, but $\mu_A(\overline{A}) = \infty$, and such that $d : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, defined by $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\overline{A}_{\mathfrak{p}})$, is not upper-semicontinuous.

Proof. Let $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n, \dots$ be infinitely many indeterminates over a field k . Let

$$R = k[t_1^2, t_1^3, t_2^2, t_2^3, \dots] \subset D = k[t_1, t_2, \dots].$$

Clearly $\overline{R} = D$. Note that for $f \in D = k[t_1, t_2, \dots]$, $f \in R$ if and only if every monomial $\lambda t_1^{i_1} \cdots t_r^{i_r}$ of f has each $i_j = 0$ or $i_j \geq 2$.

For every $n \geq 1$, let $\mathfrak{q}_n = (t_n^2, t_n^3)R$, which is a prime ideal of R of height 1. Note that for $f \in R$, $f \in \mathfrak{q}_n$ if and only if every monomial $\lambda t_1^{i_1} \cdots t_r^{i_r}$ of f has $i_n \geq 2$. It follows that $t_n \notin R_{\mathfrak{q}_n}$, because

if $t_n = a/b$, $a, b \in R$ and $b \notin \mathfrak{q}_n$, then every monomial of $a = bt_n$ has each $i_j = 0$ or $i_j \geq 2$, so has $i_n \geq 2$. Therefore, t_n appears in each monomial of b , but since $b \in R$, the exponent of t_n in each monomial of b must be at least 2, so $b \in \mathfrak{q}_n$, a contradiction.

Now, set $R \subset D_n = k[t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}, t_n^2, t_n^3, t_{n+1}, \dots] \subset D$ and $S_n = R \setminus \mathfrak{q}_n$, a multiplicatively closed subset of R . Clearly $R_{\mathfrak{q}_n} = S_n^{-1}D_n$.

CLAIM. Let I be an ideal of R such that $I \subseteq \cup_{n \geq 1} \mathfrak{q}_n$. Then I is contained in some $\mathfrak{q}_j$.

If I is contained in a finite union of $\mathfrak{q}_i$, using the ordinary prime avoidance lemma, we are done. Suppose that I is not contained in any finite union of $\mathfrak{q}_i$ and let us reach a contradiction. Take $f \in I$, $f \neq 0$. Then $f \in k[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ for some $n \geq 1$ and f is in a finite number of $\mathfrak{q}_i$, corresponding to the variables t_i that appear in every single monomial of f . We can suppose that $f \in \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r$, for some $1 \leq r \leq n$, and $f \notin \mathfrak{q}_i$, for $i > r$. Since $I \not\subseteq \mathfrak{q}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathfrak{q}_r$, there exists $g \in I$ such that $g \notin \mathfrak{q}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathfrak{q}_r$. Let $h = t_s^2 g \in I$, where $s > n$, so that f and h have no common monomials. Since $\mathfrak{q}_i$ are prime, then $h = t_s^2 g \notin \mathfrak{q}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathfrak{q}_r$. Since $f, h \in I \subseteq \cup_{n \geq 1} \mathfrak{q}_n$, then $f + h \in \mathfrak{q}_m$, for some $m \geq 1$. But since $f \in \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r$ and $h \notin \mathfrak{q}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathfrak{q}_r$, then necessarily $m > r$. Thus $f + h \in \mathfrak{q}_m$, where $m > r$. But since f and h have no common monomials, this implies that every monomial of f must contain t_m^2 , so $f \in \mathfrak{q}_m$, a contradiction. Hence $I \subseteq \mathfrak{q}_j$ for some j and the CLAIM is proved. (An alternative proof would follow from [12, Proposition 2.5], provided that k is uncountable.)

Let $S = R \setminus \cup_{n \geq 1} \mathfrak{q}_n$, a multiplicatively closed subset of R . Let $A = S^{-1}R$ and $\mathfrak{p}_n = S^{-1}\mathfrak{q}_n$. If Q is a prime ideal of R such that $Q \subseteq \cup_{n \geq 1} \mathfrak{q}_n$, then, by the CLAIM above, $Q \subseteq \mathfrak{q}_j$, for some $n \geq 1$. In particular, $\text{Spec}(A) = \{(0)\} \cup \{\mathfrak{p}_n \mid n \geq 1\}$, where each $\mathfrak{p}_n$ is finitely generated. Therefore A is a one dimensional noetherian domain.

For every $n \geq 1$, $A_{\mathfrak{p}_n} = (S^{-1}R)_{S^{-1}\mathfrak{q}_n} = R_{\mathfrak{q}_n} = S_n^{-1}D_n$. Moreover, $t_n = t_n^3/t_n^2$ is in the field of fractions of $A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}$ and $t_n^2 \in A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}$, i.e. t_n is integral over $A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}$. Thus

$$A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}[t_n] = (S_n^{-1}D_n)[t_n] = S_n^{-1}D \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}} = \overline{A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}[t_n]} = \overline{S_n^{-1}D} = S_n^{-1}(\overline{D}) = S_n^{-1}D.$$

Hence $\overline{A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}} = A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}[t_n]$. Recall that $t_n \notin R_{\mathfrak{q}_n} = A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}$ and $d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}}(t_n) \leq 2$. By Proposition 2.3, $d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}}(\overline{A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}}(A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}[t_n]) = 2$.

Consider the integral extension $A \subset \overline{A}$ and $d : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, defined by $d(\mathfrak{p}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\overline{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\overline{A_{\mathfrak{p}}})$. We have just shown that, for every $n \geq 1$, $d(\mathfrak{p}_n) = d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}}(\overline{A_{\mathfrak{p}_n}}) = 2$. On the other hand, $d((0)) = d_{Q(A)}(Q(\overline{A})) = 1$ because $Q(A) = Q(\overline{A})$. Therefore, $d^{-1}([2, +\infty)) = \text{Spec}(A) \setminus \{(0)\}$, which is not a closed set. Indeed, suppose that $\text{Spec}(A) \setminus \{(0)\} = V(I)$, for some non-zero ideal I . Since A is a one dimensional noetherian domain, I has height 1 and $V(I)$ is the finite set of associated primes to I . However, $\text{Spec}(A) \setminus \{(0)\} = \text{Max}(A)$, which is infinite, a contradiction. So $d : \text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is not upper-semicontinuous. $\square$

Remark 7.5. Contrary to the upper-semicontinuity, sub-multiplicativity does not work for one dimensional noetherian domains with finite integral closure. See Example 6.6, where A was a noetherian domain of dimension 1 and with finite integral closure.

Final comments 7.6. We finish the paper by mentioning some points that we think are worth clarifying. To simplify, suppose that $A \subset B$ and $B \subset C$ are two finite ring extensions, where, as always, A and B are two integral domains, and K and L are their fields of fractions, respectively.

- (1) In the proof of “ $A \subset B$ free and $K \subset L$ simple $\Rightarrow d_K(L) = d_A(B)$ ” could we omit the hypothesis $K \subset L$ simple. In other words, does $[L : K] = \mu_A(B)$ imply $d_K(L) = d_A(B)$?
- (2) Does the condition $d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$ localize? In particular, does $d_A(B) = \mu_A(B)$ imply $d_K(L) = [L : K]$? If A is integrally closed, the answer is affirmative.
- (3) Suppose that A and B are affine domains over a field k . For instance, suppose that A is a Noether normalization of B (see, e.g., [9, § 33, Lemma 2]). Since A is integrally closed, then $d_K(L) = d_A(B)$. If moreover k is of characteristic zero, then $K \subset L$ is simple and $d_K(L) = [L : K]$. What can we say more generally?
- (4) Can one replace $\mu_A(\overline{A})$ by $d_A(\overline{A})$ in the formula $d_A(C) \leq \mu_A(\overline{A})d_A(B)d_B(C)$?

- (5) Is the integral degree upper-semicontinuous for Nagata rings of dimension greater than 1?
- (6) Is there any clear relationship between $d_A(B)$ in one hand and $d_{A/\mathfrak{p}}(B/\mathfrak{p}B)$ and $d_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(B_{\mathfrak{p}})$ in the other hand? An affirmative answer could be used in proofs by induction on the dimension.
- (7) Upper-semicontinuity does not imply sub-multiplicativity. We wonder to what extent sub-multiplicativity could imply upper-semicontinuity.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Bourbaki, Algebra II. Chapters 4-7. Translated from the 1981 French edition by P. M. Cohn and J. Howie. Reprint of the 1990 English edition [Springer, Berlin]. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [2] N. Bourbaki, Commutative algebra. Chapters 1-7. Translated from the French. Reprint of the 1989 English translation. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [3] J.M. Giral, F. Planas-Vilanova, Integral degree of a ring, reduction numbers and uniform Artin-Rees numbers, *J. Algebra* **319** (2008), 3398-3418.
- [4] C. Huneke and I. Swanson, Integral closure of ideals, rings, and modules. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 336. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [5] N. Jacobson, Lectures in abstract algebra. III. Theory of fields and Galois theory. Second corrected printing. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 32. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1975.
- [6] C.U. Jensen, A. Ledet, N. Yui, Generic polynomials. Constructive aspects of the inverse Galois problem. Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications, 45. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [7] E. Kunz, Introduction to commutative algebra and algebraic geometry. Translated from the German by Michael Ackerman. With a preface by David Mumford. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1985.
- [8] H. Matsumura, Commutative algebra. Second edition. Mathematics Lecture Note Series, 56. Benjamin Cummings Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass., 1980.
- [9] H. Matsumura, Commutative ring theory. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 8. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [10] W. Narkiewicz, Elementary and analytic theory of algebraic numbers. Third edition. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.
- [11] J. Sally, W.V. Vasconcelos, Stable rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **4** (1974), 319-336.
- [12] R.Y. Sharp, P. Vámos, Baire’s category theorem and prime avoidance in complete local rings. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **44** (1985), no. 3, 243-248.
- [13] W.V. Vasconcelos, Computational methods in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry. With chapters by David Eisenbud, Daniel R. Grayson, Jürgen Herzog and Michael Stillman. Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, 2. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

DEPARTAMENT D’ÀLGEBRA I GEOMETRIA, UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA.
 GRAN VIA DE LES CORTS CATALANES 585, E-08007 BARCELONA. *giral@ub.edu*

MAXWELL INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.
 EH9 3DF, EDINBURGH. *L.O’Carroll@ed.ac.uk*

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTICA APLICADA 1, UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE CATALUNYA.
 DIAGONAL 647, ETSEIB, E-08028 BARCELONA. *francesc.planas@upc.edu*

DEPARTAMENT DE MATEMÀTICA APLICADA 1, UNIVERSITAT POLITÈCNICA DE CATALUNYA.
 DIAGONAL 647, ETSEIB, E-08028 BARCELONA. *bernat.plans@upc.edu*